

Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 5-7 and 10-12, which are objected as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The rejection of claims 1-4, 8, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Applicant's Related Art in view of Miwa et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "forming a seal pattern on the second substrate, the seal pattern having a plurality of triangular bent portions that each have a vertex that is directed toward an inside of the second substrate, wherein each triangular bent portion circumvents a conductive contact dot." None of the cited references, including Applicant's Related Art or Miwa et al., singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-8, which depend from claim 1, are also allowable over the cited references.

Claim 9 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 9 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "forming a seal pattern on the second substrate, the seal pattern having a plurality of semicircular bent portions, the semicircular bent portions being bent toward an inside of the second substrate, wherein each semicircular bent portion circumvents a conductive contact dot." None of the cited references, including Applicant's Related Art or Miwa et al., singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10-12, which depend from claim 9, are also allowable over the cited references.

The Examiner states the Applicant's Related Art "...discloses a method of forming a LCD panel that is basically the same as that recited in claims 1-4, 8, and 9 except that the bent portion has a rectangular shape." The Examiner then cites Miwa et al. as disclosing "...in Fig. 7(b)... a method for applying a seal pattern 30 on a substrate 20 to realize a liquid crystal cell... the seal pattern having a plurality of U-shaped portions being bent toward an inside of the substrate..." The Examiner then states "...the U-shaped portion may have a shape of a semicircle or a shape of a triangle having all three vertexes rounded with a radius as clearly shown in Fig. 7(b)." The Examiner concludes it would have been obvious "...to modify Applicant's Related Art with the teaching of Miwa by forming a seal pattern having a plurality of triangle or semicircular bent portions... so as to obtain an excellent display quality."

Applicants respectfully submit, however, that the claimed invention is not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Applicant's Related Art in view of Miwa et al. For example, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Figure 7(b) of Miwa et al. nor the related text teaches or suggests that the U-shape portion "may have a shape of a semicircle or a shape of a triangle having all three vertexes rounded with a radius", as asserted by the Examiner. Further, Applicants respectfully submit Miwa et al. fails to teach or suggest "the seal pattern having a plurality of U-shaped portions being bent toward an inside of the substrate", as also asserted by the Examiner. For example, Applicants respectfully submit that, at Figure 7(b), Miwa et al. shows wherein the U-shaped portion is bent toward an outside of the substrate. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit Miwa et al. actually teaches away from the claimed inventions. To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. See M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made at least with respect to the aforementioned combination of elements.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner deem that a telephone conference would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Respectfully submitted,

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE, LLP

By 

Rebecca Goldman Rudich
Registration No. 41,786

Date: February 12, 2003

1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
Telephone No.: (202) 496-7500
Facsimile No.: (202) 496-7756

